

Serial No. 10/840,045

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 10, 11 and 16-18 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Turner (US-4,564,035).

In addition, claims 1, 2, 6 and 13 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bowling et al. (US-1,623,231).

**CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claim 4 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turner.

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 5, 9, 12, 14 and 15 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claims 2, 4 and 5 are deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

In addition, claims 7-9 are deleted, and claim 6 is amended to form an independent claim which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 2 and 6-9 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

In addition, claims 11 and 12 are deleted, and claim 10 is amended to form an independent claim which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 10-12 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the claims 1, 3, 6, 10 and 13-18 should be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, he is urged to contact Applicant's attorney at the exchange listed below.


Respectfully submitted,

Serial No. 10/840,045

Chung-Shan Shen et al.

Dated: October 20, 2006.

By



Alan D. Kamrath

NIKOLAI & MERSEREAU, P.A.  
Attorneys for Applicants  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 820  
Minneapolis, MN 55402  
Telephone: (612) 392-7306  
Facsimile: (612) 349-6556